

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTEROHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, L.L.P. MAY 27 2004  
ATTORNEYS AT LAWONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR  
STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT 06901-2682  
U.S.A.

Unofficial

Paul D. Greeley  
Charles N.J. Ruggiero, P.C.  
Terrence J. McAllister, P.C.\*Telephone (203) 327-4500  
Facsimile (203) 327-6401  
E-mail: info@ogrp.com

David N. Koffsky (1936-2000)

May 27, 2004

Senior Counsel  
E. Gabriel Perle  
John F. Ohlandt\*Fax No. 703-746-5657George W. Rauchfuss, Jr.\*  
Robert R. Hubbard\*  
John Yankovich  
Michael A. Antista\*  
Randolph P. Calhoun\*  
J. Robert Dean\*  
Andrew Vlahos\*  
Andrew C. Gust\*  
Carrie Anne Colby\*  
Brian Young  
Jean-Paul Cass\*  
Kristina M. Grasso  
David L. Barnes  
Ned McMahon\*  
Jamie T. Gallagher  
Lea A. Nicholson\*  
Pamela L. Wingood\*  
\*Not Admitted In CT

Vazken Alexanian, Ph.D. (Agent)

To: Examiner Ms. Greta L. Robinson

From: John F. Ohlandt 

Re: Agenda for interview on Thursday, May 27, 2004

U. S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/684,207  
"Smart Calendar"

Examiner Ms. Greta Robinson has agreed to an interview on the stated date above for the discussion of what amounts to two basic issues in her final rejection of April 13, 2004.

The first issue raised by Ms. Robinson is in the "Response to Arguments," section 8, page 4, of the final rejection. She asserts that the portions of the specification pointed out by applicant's attorney, that is Figures 1 and 2, and on page 3 of the disclosure, do not support the changes made in the claim 1 in which the critical language reads as follows "a first calendar, formed of light-image responsive material, and a second calendar; a video camera and a projector of light images pointed at the first calendar." Applicant's attorney's position is that the underlined language is fully supported by these portions referred to in applicant's specification.

The essential point to be made is that the man skilled in the art knows the prior art, and being knowledgeable understands immediately upon looking at the Figures 1 and 2 that the dotted line represents a projected light image from the projector 106. See such representation, for example, in US. 6,597,410 B1 enclosed herewith. Moreover, the statement on page 3 of applicant's disclosure: "like a movie is displayed on a screen" makes this unequivocal to the man skilled in the art. Likewise, it is understood that when projection is made on the paper calendar 101, the calendar is acting as a screen to produce the light image "Meet with manager at 12:00." It is further understood that paper is a light responsive material, but the generic language "light responsive material" is properly recited since other light responsive materials can be substituted, such as cloth (as in movie houses). Accordingly, it is applicant's position that there is no doubt

that one skilled in the art can understand from the disclosure just what the invention is and thus the amended claims are fully supported by the disclosure. No new matter has been introduced.

With respect to the second issue, the Examiner is attempting to impose with respect to labeling or designating on the drawing the claim language referring to first and second calendars. It is applicant's position that there is no basis in the rules or in the law for requiring designation of precise elements on the drawing by the use of claim language. All of the calendars shown in the various figures are properly designated by reference numbers and only this is required.

Other than the above issues, there is no issue whatever with respect to any prior art citation.

Please confirm receipt of this agenda.